

Amendment to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIGS. 1, 2A, 2B, 5A, 2C, 2D, 2E, 2F, 3A, 3C, 6A, 9A and 10A. These sheets, which include FIGS. 1, 2A, 2B, 5A, 2C, 2D, 2E, 2F, 3A, 3B, 3C, 6A, 6B, 6C, 9A, 9B, 9C, 10A, 10B and 10C replace the original sheets including these figures. In FIG. 1, the legend --Prior Art-- has been added. In FIGS. 2A, 2B, 5A, 2C, 2D, 2E, 2F, 3A, 6A, 9A and 10A, various cross-hatching has been removed. In FIG. 3C, "X-DIMENSION" has been changed to "Y-DIMENSION".

Attachments: Replacement Sheets (6)
Annotated Sheets Showing Changes (6)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 12 remain in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 11 and 13-25 have been canceled, without prejudice.

Claim 3 has been amended to incorporate the limitation(s) of canceled claim 4, which the Examiner indicated is allowable. As such, amended claim 3 is now believed to be allowable.

Claims 5, 7, 9, 10 and 12, which depend from claim 3, are believed to be allowable, at least, because of their dependence on claim 3.

Reinstatement and allowance of formerly withdrawn claims 5 and 10 is requested, because these claims now depend from an allowable claim.

1. Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to because sectional view are not properly cross-hatched, and because FIG. 1 should be designated as "Prior Art".

2. Rejection of Claims 3 and 9 Under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 3 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. Pub. 2001/0002728 A1 of Tsukada. However, given the amendment to claim 3 to incorporate the limitation(s) of canceled claim 4, which the Examiner indicated to be allowable, this rejection is believed moot, and claims 3 and 9 are believed to be allowable.

3. Rejection of Claims 3 and 7 Under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. 5,680,056 of Ito. However, given the amendment to claim 3 to incorporate the limitation(s) of canceled claim 4, which the Examiner indicated to be allowable, this rejection is believed moot, and claims 3 and 7 are believed to be allowable.


4. Rejection of Claims 9 and 12 Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 9 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. 5,680,056 of Ito in view of US Pat. Pub. 2001/0002728 A1 of Tsukada. However, given 1) the amendment to claim 3 to incorporate the limitation(s) of canceled claim 4, which the Examiner indicated to be allowable, and 2) the dependence of claims 9 and 12 on claim 3, this rejection is believed moot. Claims 9 and 12 are therefore believed to be allowable.

5. Conclusion

In light of the amendments and remarks provided herein, applicants respectfully request the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
HOLLAND & HART, LLP

By: 

Gregory W. Osterloth
Reg. No. 36,232
Tel: (303) 295-8205